



2003

# Differences in Friendship Qualities of Korean and American College Students

Yun-sun Alexis Bae '03

*Illinois Wesleyan University*

---

## Recommended Citation

Bae '03, Yun-sun Alexis, "Differences in Friendship Qualities of Korean and American College Students" (2003). *Honors Projects*. Paper 22.

[http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych\\_honproj/22](http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj/22)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Ames Library, the Andrew W. Mellon Center for Curricular and Faculty Development, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. It has been accepted for inclusion in Digital Commons @ IWU by the faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@iwu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@iwu.edu).

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Running Head: FRIENDSHIP CHARACTERISTICS ACROSS CULTURES

# Friendship Characteristics Across Cultures: a Comprehensive Study of Korean and US Friendship Qualities

Alexis Y. Bae

Illinois Wesleyan University

Psychology 401

Senior Thesis

## Abstract

The present study explored the friendship characteristics of Korean and American college students. Participants (41 Koreans and 87 Americans) described their friends using a questionnaire (Friendship Quality Questionnaire) and an interview. Because of the inadequacy of the interview coding system, the interview data were not analyzed. Analysis of the FQQ supported the hypothesis that Koreans exhibit higher exclusivity than Americans, but no other country effects emerged. Both U.S. and Korean women reported more intimate disclosure than men. Friendship characteristics of Korea and U.S. students were conceptualized using concepts such as Individualism and Collectivism, Confucianism, and the Korean term “cheong” (affection). Discussion focused on methodological challenges (i.e., sampling, measurement, and multi-method assessment) and limitations of current theoretical perspectives as these apply to the present study and cross-cultural research in general.

Friendship Characteristics Across Cultures: a Comprehensive study of  
Korean and US Friendship Qualities

Throughout the lifespan, friendships have significantly influenced the developmental, environmental, and social aspects of individuals across all cultures. Numerous studies have examined the ways friendship affects psychological well-being (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). Culture, on the other hand, influences all aspects of the developmental and social features of an individual. Culture can be seen as a prominent shaper of minds, as culture serves as a learning system that “transforms basic biological capacities into meaningful thoughts and behaviors shared by its members” (Bower, 1997). Friendship qualities across cultures may then vary, following each society’s cultural norms and values.

Various cultural differences in friendship characteristics exist, including differences in the meaning of friendship and the norms and values guiding friendship behavior (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996), and even the styles of friendship (Shin, 1995). These characteristics are strongly influenced by cultural values. As such, it is important to examine whether different cultures share common values of friendship, or if their values differ. Unfortunately, these similarities or differences in friendship qualities across cultures have not been extensively studied. It remains to be determined whether friendship values and characteristics are universal or culture-specific. The lack of studies has made it difficult to generate any specific analyses of friendship quality differences among different cultures. The present study will begin with reviewing certain theoretical concepts that, in the past, have commonly been applied to explain cultural differences,

and examine how those concepts may apply to the study of friendship characteristic differences across cultures.

### Individualism and Collectivism

Most studies that have examined cross-cultural differences of various societal aspects have focused on the concepts of individualism and collectivism, which were first discussed by Hofstede, to explain the differences observed between cultural groups (Leung & Bond, as cited in Singelis, 1994). These two concepts have been the major focus of most cross-cultural studies. Individualism and collectivism as a whole refers to the degrees to which a culture encourages, fosters, and facilitates the needs, wishes, desires, and values of an autonomous and unique self over those of a group (Matsumoto, 2000). According to Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002), Collectivism is based on the assumption that groups bind and mutually obligate individuals. Collectivistic cultures place priority on subordinating personal goals to those of the in-group. Cultures in Asia, Africa, South America, and the Pacific Islands are identified as collectivist cultures (Singelis, 1994).

On the other hand, individualism emphasizes self-fulfillment (Oyserman et al., 2002); Singelis (1994) defined it as giving priority to personal goals over in-group goals. Cultures in Europe, America, and Australia are assumed to be high in Individualism. Individualistic cultures, on the other hand, emphasize personal identity, autonomy, and place individual needs, wishes, desires, and values of the self over the group (Verkyuten & Masson, 1996; Matsumoto, 2002). Individualistic cultures views of the “self” focuses primarily on personal and internal attributes (Matsumoto, 2002). Consequently, individualistic people are associated with concern for maintaining and enhancing their

self-esteem (Oyserman et al., 2002). It can be presumed then, that individualistic individuals will emphasize enhancement of self esteem and self-worth through their interpersonal relationships.

Collectivistic cultures are seen as group-oriented, and it is hypothesized that individuals in a collectivistic culture tend to be more exclusive toward outside members than individuals in an individualistic culture. Thus, it is presumed that individuals in a collectivistic culture will have a smaller social network, but will perceive their relationships with their in-group members as being highly intimate. In Verkuyten and Masson's 1996 study, individuals from a collectivistic culture were shown to have fewer friends, but viewed their friendships as closer, than the individuals from an individualistic culture. Collectivistic individuals also indicated less intimacy with other-than-best friends.

Collectivistic individuals who emphasize group solidarity and emotional dependence may place more emphasis on sharing with each other (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). Thus, whereas individualistic cultures, such as the U.S., may emphasize enhancement of self-worth through friendships and other types of relationships, collectivistic cultures like Korea, may emphasize more heavily on instrumental aid and emotional dependency between individuals.

Recently several limitations of the Individualism/Collectivism paradigm have emerged. One concern is that the focus on Individualism and Collectivism oversimplifies cultural differences. In fact, one researcher who applied this construct to the comparison between Chinese and Canadians warned not to generalize his results (Li,

2002). Culture and its effect on people is multifaceted, and it is difficult to assert that one theory applies to every cultural difference observed.

Another limitation to the application of Individualism and Collectivism is its conflicting results that have emerged from studies comparing the characteristics of individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Some studies have found that participants from collectivistic cultures and those from individualistic cultures scored similarly on measures of independence and self-reliance, two constructs that are commonly applied to Individualistic cultures (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). Some researchers have pointed out that the evidence for cross-cultural differences in Collectivism and Individualism is seriously limited due to the fact that most studies place emphasis on only four Asian cultures, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and the People's Republic of China, to represent collectivistic cultures (Oyserman et al., 2002).

Differences within the same Individualistic and Collectivistic cultures are cited as an additional limitation. As certain cultures are grouped as Individualistic, and others are grouped as Collectivistic, individual differences between cultures within the same group (i.e. Individualists and Collectivists) are not accounted for. For example, Korea, China, and Japan are considered to be collectivistic cultures, and are assumed to be similar because they are collectivists. But this obscures important differences between these cultures. However, some studies have begun to show that there are differences within the same Collectivistic cultures.

Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand, and Yuki (1995) for example, found differences between Korea and Japan. Koreans had high levels of emotional relatedness to others, whereas Japanese had the lowest score on relatedness. In fact the Japanese

scored the lowest on several measures of collectivism, in comparison to four other Collectivistic cultures. The researchers argued that historical circumstances may help explain the difference between Korea and Japan. After regaining independence from Japan after World War II, and the division of North and South after the Korean War may have contributed to the sense of nationalism and high level of emotional relatedness. Japanese, on the other hand, abandoned the traditional values of interpersonal obligations after their defeat in WWII, as those values were seen to be too closely linked with ultranationalism. This led to less relatedness with others that was confirmed in the study.

Some researchers have stated that the concept of Collectivism may apply more fully to China than to either Korea or Japan. Whereas researchers mentioned above stated that Korea and Japan differed on many characteristics, these researchers thought that Korea and Japan have more common roots that were distinct from China, and in fact found that Chinese showed the highest effect size for collectivism, and Koreans and Japanese had the lowest effect size (Oyserman et al., 2002). More studies need to be done to assess how much this theoretical concept can be applied to cultures that are termed either collectivistic or individualistic.

Although there are limitations to applying Individualism and Collectivism in explaining all aspects of cultural differences, the present study will continue to employ the concepts to explain certain cultural effects on friendship characteristics. As the field currently lacks new models that can explain differences among cultures, the current model, albeit its limitations, will be useful to elucidate certain cultural differences in friendship characteristics. It is important to keep in mind that this concept does not take into account individual cultural differences.



A comparison between Korean and U.S. friendship qualities was conducted to explore differences in friendship characteristics between two cultures that are each thought to represent Collectivistic and Individualistic cultures. Korea was chosen to be studied, as the researcher is a native of Korea, and is bilingual, allowing for the research to take place in both Korea and the U.S. Korea has traditionally been influenced by other Asian cultures that geographically surround Korea, such as China and Japan. Confucianism, a philosophy that spread from China to Korea and Japan, is deeply reflected in the values and belief systems of Koreans. As Korea is becoming more and more influenced by Western culture, it is imperative to assess whether their fundamental friendship value system is also being affected, and is absorbing, the values of the Western cultures.

#### Korean Friendship Characteristics

Korea, geographically located between China and Japan, boasts of a history of 5000 years. Due to its location, the Korean culture shares many similarities with the Chinese and Japanese culture, as all three countries have historically been known to exchange merchandise, artifacts, teachings of the sage, and culture. The three countries however, immensely differ from each other. Each country has its own unique culture that affects its people differently from the others. When comparing two different cultures, such as Japanese and Chinese, although they may have some shared emphasis on certain social characteristics, the two differ in ways that markedly affect how the people of those cultures views themselves (Bower, 1997).

Nevertheless, one can not disregard the similarities either. One of the commonalities that exist within all three cultures is the influence of Confucius (551-479

BC). Confucius, the prominent philosopher of both morals and politics, based his teachings on “xiao” or filial piety. From this basic element, his fundamental teachings of the six essential relationships emerged, which are; parent-child, husband-wife, ruler-subject, teacher-student, and friend-friend. As these relationships are based on filial piety, most emphasize obedience and respect. Only the friend-friend relationship is based on equality (<http://www.friesian.com/confuci.htm>). The basic elements of Confucian teachings were spread throughout China, and onto Korea and Japan. His teachings have deeply influenced Korean, Japanese, and Chinese values. According to Elvin and Tu (as cited in Li, 2002), despite the influence of Maoist teachings and Western influence, much of Confucian traditions strongly remain in Chinese society. In Korean elementary, middle, and high school, students are continued to be taught Confucian philosophy.

His philosophy on friendship relations differed from the other four relationships. Friendship is based on equality, and Confucius believed that through this relationship with others, the self could cultivate. Thus, Confucian philosophy is such that even at the risk of losing one’s individual autonomy, by choosing fellowship of like-minded companions, people will develop together, and through each other will deepen and broaden one’s selfhood. It is also interesting to note that the Confucian idea of maintaining personal identity is based solely on continually opening the self to others. Involvement with others is required for self-development and this belief in the importance of establishing fellowship with others can be summoned up in this quote by Confucius; “Wishing to establish oneself, one establishes others; wishing to enlarge oneself, one enlarges others.” (Marsella, Devos, & Hsu, 1985).

Although Confucian teachings are still prevalent in Korean culture, it is unsure as to how much of Confucianism's fundamental beliefs of friendship are still applicable to the friendships of those in contemporary Korea. Confucian values of family relationships may have become the prototypes for other relationships. The intense intimacy that exists between Korean family members, which is exemplary of Confucian beliefs, may permeate into Koreans' relationships with others, such as in their relationships with friends. Such intimacy may be explained through the concept of "cheong", the Korean term for affection, or the affective bond that consolidates individuals together. Cheong refers to the joining of individuals into a new collective unit, and incorporates aspects of unconditional acceptance, trust and intimacy. Cheong can apply to both friends and family members (Choi, Kim, & Choi, 1993). Cheong may be closely tied to Confucianism, as the deep affection for family and friends appear to be similar to the Confucian values of maintaining intimate family relationships.

The few generalizations made about friendship characteristics of the Korean people are as following. First, it is hypothesized that Koreans will be more exclusive toward outside members than Americans. In a study by French, Bae, Pidada, and Lee (2003), Korean and American college students kept a two-week social interactions journal. The researchers found that Koreans were engaged in much more exclusive relationships with friends than Americans. Shin (1995), compared the number of friends of the Anglo-American sample with that of the Korean sample, in which data revealed that the Anglo-Americans indicated more mutual friends than Koreans. The smaller number of friends by the Korean sample may be due to Koreans' higher exclusivity. In a different study that compared Chinese and Canadian children, Chinese children were

found to interact in smaller cliques than Canadians (Chen & Rubin, as cited in Shin, 1995). Such high exclusivity in Koreans and Chinese may be due to collectivistic characteristics.

A second hypothesis researchers have proposed is that Koreans may have significantly higher rates of self-disclosure when compared to Americans. In the study by French et al. (2003), Koreans showed significantly higher intimacy and self-disclosure than Americans. The researchers suggest that Koreans may have more personal disclosures with friends than Americans because Koreans view friendships to be extremely intimate and the boundaries between friends to be somewhat blurred. French et al. (2003), also used the term “cheong” to explain Koreans’ intimate disclosures. They proposed that cheong may account for higher intimate disclosures, and also for the higher exclusivity found in Korean friendship groups.

A third hypothesis of Korean friendship characteristics is that instrumental aid will be evident in most friendships. Instrumental aid includes gift exchange, helping each other with chores or homework (as opposed to emotional support), loaning or giving money, etc. Although no studies have been done in Korea, there have been studies done in China and Japan that show these characteristics. Researchers have stated that there are rules in friendships that are endorsed and applied to each relationship, rules such as providing emotional support, offering help when needed, and repaying debts and favors (Argyle & Henderson, 1985). More studies must be done in Korea to verify this, and the present study hypothesizes this characteristic will also be shown in Korean friendships.

In a study of Chinese friendships, Gates (as cited in Smart, 1999) found that gift exchange was important, as friendships are expected to express themselves tangibly as

well as symbolically. Gift giving plays a leading role in maintaining, reproducing, and modifying personal relations (Yan, as cited in Smart, 1999), and is used to cultivate and strengthen relationships (Pieke, as cited in Smart, 1999). Beaver (as cited in Smart, 1999) noticed that instrumental aid came foremost in a number of cases. Instrumental aid was compared to the American culture, and in contrast to Americans who believe friendships that revolve around instrumental aid will lead to instability in friendship, the Chinese carried obligations in reciprocity and expectations of assistance, traits not apparent in the American culture. A western journalist cited in Beaver's study was quoted to say that the constant gift-giving and obligations even made him feel uneasy. Chinese friendships involved high levels of gift exchange compared to Americans (Smart, 1999). However, although gift exchanges are an important part of a relationship, the relationship itself is presented as primary, whereas gift exchanges are treated as secondary, because when the relationship becomes apparent that it involves around material interest, the exchange is seen as bribery (Yang, as cited in Smart, 1999). In other words, instrumental purposes are presented as a subordinate method in developing a relationship (Smart, 1999).

Similar characteristics are also shown in Japanese friendships. Japanese also have a formalized custom of gift exchange. In fact, gift exchange is greatly emphasized, especially for relationships outside the family (Argyle & Henderson, 1985). Although no separate studies have been done for Korea, it is hypothesized this aspect of friendship will also apply to Koreans, as Japanese, Chinese, and Koreans are viewed to be collectivistic cultures that emphasize relatedness to others. Also, Japanese and Koreans are viewed to share common views (Oyserman et al., 2002), thus allowing for the

assumption that Koreans may also emphasize instrumental aid as an important feature in friendships.

### U.S. Friendship Characteristics

Although the majority of cross-cultural studies compare other cultures with the U.S., most studies neglect to provide theoretical concepts to explain American cultural phenomena. However, one theory, the social exchange theory, may explain some aspects of American friendship characteristics. Social exchange theory refers to the trading of benefits within a relationship. In other words, people are drawn to relationships that provide equity, or the state of affairs in which one's own benefits and costs from the relationship are proportional to the benefits and costs incurred by the friend (Kenrick, Neuberg, & Cialdini, 2002). The concept of equity may in fact be associated with Individualism, another concept commonly applied to the U.S. However, due to the lack of theoretical explanations of the American culture, it is unclear as to whether the social exchange theory can explain all aspects of American friendship characteristics.

Along with the social exchange theory, the concept of Individualism may also explain some features of American friendships. As mentioned above, individualistic cultures tend to be more inclusive towards outside members, thus allowing for the hypothesis that Americans will have larger number of friends in their social networks. Indeed it was shown in a cross-cultural comparison study of the number of friends indicated by Americans and Koreans that American tended to have larger social networks, with a larger number of mutual friends (Shin, 1995). This may be due to the fact that Americans are less exclusive than Koreans, or may be due to a completely different

reason; however, no studies have been known to explore the reasons behind this phenomenon, thus making it difficult to state why Americans tend to have more friends.

As mentioned in the above section, Americans are also hypothesized to have less intimate disclosures than Koreans. However, it is important to note, different results have been found in cross-cultural studies of self-disclosure. In a study by Goodwin and Lee (1994), Americans had higher rates of self-disclosure, and also generated and reciprocated more self-disclosure during intimate conversations. Such discrepancies in cross-cultural studies have made it difficult to assert disclosure characteristics of Americans and Koreans' friendships.

A third aspect of friendship characteristics that may differ from Koreans is that Americans may view friendships as a way to increase their self-worth, and receive self-esteem support from friends. As Bower (1997) stated, the Western concept of a sovereign self is one that treats others as independent operators, each of whom must emphasize self-esteem in order to succeed in life. Thus, increasing self-esteem may be a friendship characteristic that is prevalent for Americans, in which friendships serve the purpose of enhancing self-worth in individuals. Some researchers have suggested that friendships impact social development of individuals by providing a sense of worth (Park, 1992). Americans are viewed to be highly individualistic, and one common feature of individualism is that it emphasizes the self. It can be hypothesized that friendships then may be used as a way to enhance self-worth and self-esteem. The hypotheses of presumed friendship characteristic differences across cultures need to be studied more comprehensively in order to verify the proposed premises.

Aside from differences in friendship characteristics across cultures, gender differences in friendship norms also exist within the same culture. In fact, some studies have shown that gender effects are even stronger than that of cultural effects (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). Gender differences in the perception and values of friendships within cultures are important to assess, as it allows for further exploration of additional aspects of friendship that are important in explaining friendship characteristics. Examining gender differences will illustrate friendship characteristics more extensively.

#### Gender Differences in Friendship Characteristics

Several studies have shown that there is a discrepancy between gender differences and cultural differences in the perception of desired friendship characteristics (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996; Goodwin & Lee, 1994). In other words, within the same culture, males and females perceive friendships differently. According to Kashima et al. (1995), there is not a great deal of parallel between gender and cultural differences in characteristics such as self-construal. The differences in how males and females perceived friendship across cultures were independent of cultural effects; gender effects in the perception of friendship were found to be independent of individualism and collectivism (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996).

In general, females are hypothesized to be more willing to disclose intimate information to their friends (Wheeler, Reis, & Bond, 1989). Goodwin and Lee's 1994 study showed that females indeed engaged more willingly in intimate self-disclosure than their male counterparts. Not only are they more willing, but females tend to share more information on intimate topics with their best friend (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). It is inferred that males may engage in less self-disclosure for fear of appearing homosexual,



or because of the gender roles taught by society that stresses expressiveness for females, but not for males. It could also be explained in functional conflict terms, in that men are less expressive to secure and maintain power over the other partner (Fisherman, as cited in Goodwin & Lee, 1994). Females were also more attentive and sensitive to their friends than males, used more personality characteristics to describe best friends, perceived their friendships as more close than males did, and emphasized the importance of trust and confidence in a friend more (Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). Such gender differences in the perception of friendships were also found in a study done with Chinese participants (Li, 2002). Chinese females rated dimensions such as helpfulness as ideal characteristics in a best friend, whereas Chinese males rated higher on extroversion, assertiveness, and application as ideal.

It is interesting to note that in some cases, the gender differences were displayed in opposite fashion when two cultures were compared. For instance, gender differences were found in both Chinese and Canadian samples for perceived connectedness between self and a friend. Instead of both female samples of the two countries indicating they felt more close to their friends, Chinese males reported feeling closer to their friends than females, whereas the Canadian females felt closer to their friends than Canadian males, contradicting Verkuyten and Masson's (1996) results that females across all ethnic groups were found to feel more close to their friends than males. This was an intriguing finding, as it demonstrates that gender differences do not necessarily mirror cultural differences. Cultural differences do not always correspond with expected gender differences (Li, 2002).

As can be seen, there are vast differences in friendship characteristics across cultures, and also between genders. Due to the lack of cross-cultural studies in general however, it is difficult to determine what accounts for these cultural differences. There has especially been a lack of studies in the developmental and social aspects of psychology, such as those assessing friendship characteristics across cultures. With the gradual discrediting of the concepts such as individualism and collectivism, a paradigm shift in cross-cultural psychology has begun, yet no other model has been developed to replace the previous theoretical model that, in the past, had commonly been applied to cross-cultural studies to explain the differences observed across cultures. Without a theory to justify why cultural differences may exist as a general rule, it will be difficult to assay why differences exist in friendship characteristics across cultures. Is it due to the individualistic and collectivistic characters of each culture? What else may account for the differences? The present paper will examine the friendship characteristics of two seemingly very different cultures, Korea and the US, assess the differences in friendship values between the two cultures, and address what may be some of the reasons behind these differences. Gender differences in the perception of friendship will also be measured to examine how gender effects may explain certain aspects of friendship characteristics and values.

Cross-cultural research in Korea and US was conducted to assess the friendship characteristics of the two cultures. The study consisted of two parts; in the first portion, the participants were asked to fill out several questionnaires, followed by a semi-structured, open-ended interview about two friends the participants chose. The second portion required participants to keep a daily diary of every social interaction that lasted

for more than ten minutes over a two week period. The diary study assessed many of the same friendship characteristics, such as exclusivity and intimate disclosure, as the present study. In the present paper, only the first portion of the research will be addressed extensively, and the results from the social interaction journals will be referenced to support the findings. The study hypothesizes that Koreans will be more exclusive and engages in more intimate disclosures than Americans, and that Koreans and Americans will place emphasis on different aspects of friendship such as instrumental aid for Koreans and enhancement of self-worth for Americans. Gender differences are also expected to emerge, such as women will engage in more intimate disclosure with friends than men.

As the field is currently lacking cross-cultural studies on friendship traits, the present study may be able to provide important information that may assist in the better understanding of cultural and gender differences in friendship characteristics.

## Method

### Participants

Two samples, one from Korea and one from the US, participated in the present study. College students were recruited for both samples. The Korean sample included 41 participants (21 males and 20 females), with the ages ranging from 19 to 25,  $M = 21.9$ . The men were slightly older than the women (22.4 vs. 22). The majority of the participants were seniors (41.5%), followed by juniors (36.6%), and lastly by sophomores (22%).

The US sample comprised of 87 participants, 38 females and 49 males, with the age ranging from 17 to 22,  $M = 19.5$ . The mean age for men and women were similar (19.6 for men, and 19.3 for women). Most of the American participants were sophomores (48%), followed by freshmen (11%), then juniors and seniors. Additional demographic characteristics of the Korean and American participants are summarized in Table 1.

The Korean participants were recruited from Yonsei University, in Seoul, Korea. Yonsei University, located in central Seoul, is one of the top three universities in Korea, and is known for their academic excellence. They have a student enrollment of about 37,000, including 24,000 undergraduates. Seoul, the capital of Korea, has a population of approximately ten million people, which accounts for a quarter of its entire national population. Seoul is the center for most major businesses and education.

The American participants were enlisted from Illinois Wesleyan University, a small, Midwestern liberal arts college located in Bloomington, Illinois. IWU has an enrollment of approximately 2000 undergraduate students.

## Measures

All questionnaires were administered to both American and Korean participants. The format remained constant after the translation of the English versions into the Korean versions. Before the questionnaires were handed out, the participants were given two copies of an Informed Consent form that explained the study in general terms and also ensured that all information would be kept confidential. Contact information was also included for the participants if they had any questions following the interview. Participants were asked to sign both copies, and once the researcher also signed the forms, one copy was given to the participant to keep, while the researcher kept the other.

Friendship Quality Questionnaire. The Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ) used in the present study was modified from Parker and Asher's (1993) original FQQ that examined friendship qualities. The FQQ for the present study consists of 45 items and is used to analyze friendship characteristics such as companionship, instrumental aid, intimate disclosure, conflict, enhancement of self-esteem, reliability, and exclusivity.

Participants were asked to identify two same-sex, close friends that they had rated as a one or a two on the Social Network Questionnaire. The Social Network Questionnaire asks participants to list peers they have interactions with, along with ratings of how close they perceive the friendship to be for each peer, on a scale of one to four. One indicated closest friends, and four indicated least close friends. The remaining data on the Social Network Questionnaire is part of a second study, not included for the present study. Participants then answered the Friendship Quality Questionnaire for each of the two closest friends they had chosen. Items such as "He/she tells me I am good at things" or "He/she helps me with tasks so that I can get done faster" were answered on a

seven point Likert scale, in which the participant indicated how well the question applies to his or her friendship with that particular friend.

The questionnaires for the Korean participants followed the same format in which they were asked to choose two same-sex, close friends from their Social Network Questionnaire. The FQQ was translated into Korean, and again back translated, to compare with the English FQQ version before it was conducted to the Korean participants.

Cronbach's alpha was assessed for each scale of the FQQ from both the US and Korean samples. Internal consistency showed to be fairly high for each country for all of the scales. The Companionship scale had an internal consistency of .82 for the US, and .79 for Korea. The Reliability scale had an internal consistency of .89 for the US, and .87 for Korea. The US sample showed a much higher internal consistency of .91 in the Intimate disclosure scale, compared to the .77 of the Korean sample. Detailed descriptions of Cronbach's alpha for each of the individual scales are recorded in Table 2.

Friendship Interview. The interview was open-ended, semi-structured in format. The participants were asked seven questions each about the two friends they had chosen for the FQQ. The questions were always asked twice to obtain as much information from the participants as possible, and to ensure they understood the entire spectrum of the question being asked.

The interview included questions such as "Why do you like this friend?", "What are the important characteristics of this friendship?" and "How do you two behave when you are together, just the two of you/ with other people?" Researchers and research assistants were given an interview script to follow strictly and were instructed not to ask

misleading questions that might lead participants to answer differently or change their initial responses. However, if a response was vague, researchers were allowed to ask questions such as “Could you explain more clearly what you meant by \_\_\_\_\_?” in order to verify its precise meaning.

The Korean interviews were administered in the same way. The interview questions were translated into Korean and back translated into English to make sure the Korean interview questions were conveying the same meanings as the English version.

#### Independence/Interdependence Questionnaire. The

Independence/Interdependence Questionnaire used in the present study is a modified version of Kato and Markus’ (1993) Independence/Interdependence Questionnaire. It consists of 31 items assessing the Independent/Interdependent tendency of an individual. Questions such as “When making a decision, I first consider how it will affect others before considering how it will affect me” or “If I like it, I do not care what other people would think of my idea” are answered by a nine point Likert scale and the participant indicates how well each question applies to oneself.

The Korean translations of this questionnaire, as with the previous questionnaires, was first done by a Korean professor at Chung-bok University and again back into English by a Korean-American student at a nearby university to ensure that the Korean version of the questionnaire was correctly assessing the same variables as the English version.

#### Procedure

US sample. Participants from the US sample were recruited through sign-up sheets that were posted on the Psychology Bulletin in the Psychology Department of

IWU. The participants were from General Psychology classes and received all three research credits for their Research Experience project, which all students must partake in to receive full credit for the General Psychology class. They were given 10 dollars for their completion of the study. However, if a participant decided not to complete the study they were only given one research credit and no cash bonus was allotted.

Students signed up for individual sessions and it was indicated on the sign-up sheet that a researcher would meet the student by the Bulletin Board at their assigned times. A researcher met the participant and led the individual to a Psychology lab that was provided by the department. The first meeting entailed the participant to fill out the questionnaires. Once the questionnaires were completely filled out, the friendship interview was held, in which the researcher manually wrote down the participant's responses verbatim. Another portion of this study, the Social Interaction Journals, was explained to the participants and once the instructions were told, the first meeting adjourned. The Social Interaction Journals requires participants to record every interaction they had that was more than 10 minutes in length. The participants recorded who they had an interaction with, the length of the interaction, and rated the interaction's level of intimacy, quality, and conflict. The Social Interaction Journals, along with the Social Network Questionnaire is part of a second study, and the data for the journals and questionnaire were not used in the present study. Once the participants completed two weeks of journal entries and were turned in to the research lab, the researcher contacted the participants to set up a second meeting time for debriefing. The participants were given a debriefing form, were given three research credits, and paid ten dollars for the



completion of the study. If the participant did not complete the journal portion of the study, they were given one research credit, and were not paid.

Korean sample. The Korean participants were recruited differently from the US sample. Instead of sign-up sheets, informational sheets were posted on several student bulletin boards around campus, which contained brief information of the present study and a phone number and email address of the researcher to contact if students were interested in participating. Students voluntarily called or emailed the researcher and set up interview times. The students were asked to meet the researcher at the Student Union, and the experiment was held in an open area in the Union. The procedure of the interview replicated that of the US study. Once the questionnaires were filled out, the Friendship Interview was held. Instructions for the Social Interaction Journal were given to the participants. Once the two weeks of journal entries were completed and turned in to the lab that was provided by the Yonsei Psychology Department, the researcher contacted the participant and set up a second meeting time. The same debriefing process as the US participants followed, and the participants were paid 40,000 won (approximately 30 US dollars) for the completion of the study. The Korean participants were paid more than the American participants because they were not awarded class credit as the American students had been.

Because the English and Korean versions of the questionnaires were all answered by the Likert scale, data entry for the questionnaires of both American and Korean participants were done simultaneously, and there was no need to translate the responded questionnaires again. However, the translations for the Korean interview sets were needed, and the researcher translated the interviews into English. A Korean student at

IWU, who was blind to the study's hypotheses to ensure the translations were not biased, translated it back into Korean to make certain the English translations of the interviews were expressing the Korean participants' responses as accurately as possible.

A coding system to analyze the Friendship Interview for the American and Korean data was arranged by the researcher. A modified version of a coding system by French, Fosco, Pidada, Jansen, Riansari, and Nelwan (2002) was used, with a few items being added to the original coding manual. Once the coding manual was finalized, three research assistants, who were also kept from knowing the hypotheses of the study, along with the researcher, coded the participant's responses in accordance with the coding manual. Two of the four coders coded the interviews to assess reliability.

## Results

The results from the analyses of the Friendship Quality Questionnaire and Friendship Interview are presented in the following section.

### Friendship Quality Questionnaire

A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA was conducted for individual scales of the FQQ. The means and standard deviations broken down by country and gender are presented in Table 3. Included in this table are analysis results.

Significant differences between U.S. and Korean students emerged in the Companionship and Exclusivity scales. U.S. students reported more companionship in their friendships than did Korean students,  $F(1, 123) = 9.18, p < .01$ . Korean students reported higher exclusivity than U.S. students,  $F(1, 123) = 25.72, p < .01$ .

Main effects for gender emerged for the Intimate Disclosure and Enhancement of self-worth scales. Women from both countries scored higher than the men in Intimate

disclosure,  $F(1, 123) = 6.89, p < .01$ . Korean and American women also reported higher Enhancement of self-worth than the men,  $F(1, 123) = 14.27, p < .01$ .

An interaction effect was reported for the Conflict scale. The analysis of the raw scores yielded a significant country by gender interaction,  $F(1, 123) = 4.33, p < .05$ . American men reported more conflicts with friends than American women, and Korean women reported more conflicts with friends than Korean men. These results, however, did not emerge in the analysis of standardized scores.

Finally, no significant effects were found from the analysis of the Instrumental Aid or Reliable Alliance scales. Similar non-significant results emerged from the analysis of both the raw and standardized scores.

#### Friendship Interview

Reliability was assessed between coders for the Friendship Interview. The percentages of agreement between two coders are presented in Table 4. Also included in this table are Kappa coefficients, which are an index of the actual agreements adjusted for chance agreements. Review of percentage agreement reveals high agreement between coders. The Kappa coefficient, however, reveal that some of this agreement could possibly be attributable to chance, as a consequence of either high or low frequency of occurrence of a behavior within a particular scale. If .70 is taken as a minimally acceptable level of Kappa, it is apparent that only four of the thirteen scales fall into this range.

Due to the difficulties with coding and the low reliability between coders, this measure was not analyzed further.

## Discussion

Comparisons of main effect differences between U.S. and Korean students on the Friendship Quality Questionnaire yielded results that were only partially consistent with the study's hypotheses. As expected, Korean students expressed more exclusivity than U.S. students. It was also expected that Korean students would show more intimate disclosure and instrumental aid than U.S. students, results that were not obtained in the present study. It was also expected that U.S. students would report more enhancement of self-worth, but no significant country effect emerged. Finally, although no hypotheses were made for the companionship scale or reliable alliance scale, significant results emerged for companionship. U.S. students scored higher than Korean students on companionship, but no differences emerged for reliable alliance.

Korean students' higher exclusivity may be explained by Koreans' emphasis on their in-groups (cliques) and their high levels of interdependence on each other, as is expected from a presumed Collectivistic culture. It may also be explained through their reference to the concept of affection, or "cheong" which ties the people within a group together (Choi et al., 1993), thus making it difficult for people outside the group to share or receive this "affection" and ultimately resulting in a very exclusive group of friends. In the concurrent diary study by French et al. (2003), the researchers showed that Koreans' interactions with close friends were more exclusive than that of U.S. students, results that were consistent with the questionnaire results. In the diary study, it was also found that Korean students interacted with a smaller number of friends, which may also reflect this higher exclusivity within friendship groups. The diary study illustrates the

importance of multi-method assessment in cross-cultural studies, as confidence in the results increase significantly when the same results emerge.

The present results with regard to exclusivity are consistent with my experiences in Korea and the U.S. In my personal experience, Koreans tend to exhibit more exclusive behaviors than Americans. It is very difficult to integrate oneself into a new Korean group, as the group members are tightly bounded, and usually share a long history together. Members of close groups typically feel very close to each other, and may experience wariness when a new person attempts to join the group. Of course, individuals vary in how exclusive they are to outside members, but small, tight-knit cliques are extremely common in the Korean society. Conversely, Americans tend to be more open to outside members. It is much easier to join an already formed group and not feel like the outside member.

Koreans did not report more intimate disclosures than Americans in the FQQ. This finding differs from our diary results in which we found that Korean students engage in more intimate disclosures with their friends than U.S. students. We explained that this behavior is consistent with the idea that Korean friendships are intimate to the degree that boundaries between friends are blurred (French et al., 2003). Such intimacy may come from Koreans' high exclusiveness. As Koreans spend most of their time with people they know very well, it may be easier for them to disclose intimate details of their lives exclusively to the people they experience *cheong* with.

The discrepancies found in the analysis of the FQQ and diary study might be attributable to the questions on the FQQ. It may be that the items on the questionnaire were not able to correctly assess intimate disclosure. Or it may be the non-significant

results were caused by response set biases. Hui (1989) suggested that for Asians, it is important to be modest, and avoid appearing “boisterous”; consequently Asians may respond to self-report scales cautiously. By using the middle of the scale, and avoiding extreme scores, Koreans may have been trying to express modesty on their part, thus producing insignificant results for intimate disclosure. In the present study, however, we attempted to correct this bias by analyzing standardized scores, i.e. the Z-scores of the Intimate disclosure scale, and did not find any significant results. Thus, the insignificant results can not be fully explained by response set biases.

Although it had been hypothesized, no significant results were found for the Instrumental aid scale. This may have been due to methodological limitations such that the FQQ and Interview questions were not able to tap into relevant qualities of instrumental aid. Or it may be because specific types of instrumental aid vary by culture. For example, the Chinese have a strong emphasis on gift exchange (Gates, as cited in Smart, 1999), as do the Japanese (Argyle & Henderson, 1985). In Japan, gift exchange is so prevalent in their culture, that a formalized custom of gift exchange is present (Argyle, Henderson, Bond, Iizuka, & Contarello, 1986). Such material aid may pertain specifically to the Japanese culture, and not to the Korean culture. It is possible that Koreans have other aspects of Instrumental aid that was not tested in any of the measures.

It also may be that instrumental aid does not exist in elevated amounts in the Korean culture, and the previous assumption made on higher instrumental aid for Koreans was erroneous. The hypothesis made for Koreans was based on studies of Chinese and Japanese instrumental aid, because it was assumed that the Korean culture shares similarities with the Chinese and Japanese cultures. It could be that instrumental

aid pertains more to the Chinese and Japanese, and plays a minimal part in the Korean society. The researcher's personal observations of the Korean culture and past acquaintances with Japanese are consistent with this latter proposal. Instrumental aid is not as obvious in Koreans as it is in Japanese, and does not appear to play huge part in friendship circles.

In my experience, Korean friendships have no apparent difference from observed American friendship circles in instrumental aid, which would be consistent with the non-significant findings of the present study. Future studies should be aware of generalizing cultural specificities across cultures. Researchers may first want to compare Korean, Chinese, and Japanese instrumental aid to distinguish culture-specific characteristics before generalizing instrumental aid to be apparent in all three cultures.

Insignificant results for Instrumental aid may also have been shown in the present study due to the age range of the participants. It may be that, in general, college students across cultures rely on their friends for instrumental aid, thus not showing significant differences between the Korean and American college students who participated in the present study. It could be that Korean adults are higher in instrumental aid than American adults, a population that was not assessed in this study. It would be interesting for future studies to address this issue, and assess the Instrumental aid scale across a wider age range and compare the results across cultures.

Enhancement of self-worth was assumed to be higher in Americans, but no significant results were found. Instead, women across cultures reported higher enhancement of self-worth than men. It could be that women, and not Americans, scored higher on this scale because enhancement of self-worth is a function of intimate

relationships rather than a function of Individualism, as others have previously hypothesized.

A new finding that was not hypothesized was found, in which Americans emphasized companionship with friends more than Koreans. The reasons behind this cultural difference are unclear. It may be due to the fact that Koreans emphasize emotional dependence, which would also explain the higher levels of intimate disclosure that was found in the diary study, whereas Americans emphasize recreational mobility; that is, friends are needed to do something with, and thus showed higher companionship ratings. No significant differences between Koreans and Americans emerged for reliable alliance; no directional hypotheses for this variable were made.

Significant gender differences across cultures for the FQQ also emerged, and the hypothesis that women will engage in more intimate disclosures with friends was supported. This may be due to gender roles taught by society (Fisherman, as cited in Goodwin & Lee, 1994), which allow women to be expressive and share their emotions with others, while looking down on men who do the same. Such gender differences in intimate disclosure emerged in other studies that assessed friendship characteristics (Goodwin & Lee, 1994; Verkuyten & Masson, 1996). Along with higher intimate disclosure for women, enhancement of self-worth was also found to be higher for women across cultures, as mentioned in the above section.

No hypothesis had been made for the conflict scale, but a significant interaction effect emerged, with American men scoring higher than American women, and Korean women scoring higher than Korean men. However, these results from the raw scores are inconsistent with the results from the standardized scores, which did not find any



significant results, including an interaction effect. These inconsistencies may be caused by response set biases, such that American men and Korean women used extreme scores to report conflicts, whereas American women and Korean men used middle-range scores. By adjusting for the extreme scores, the standardized scores may have found no significant differences between Koreans and Americans or between men and women. The effects for the conflict scale thus remain inconclusive.

Although the interviews were not analyzed further, because of the low reliability among the raters, it is important to use such measures in future studies, for multi-method assessment purposes. The interview data may have provided a more in-depth analysis of friendship characteristics in Korea and the U.S., and also may have been able to increase the validity of the Friendship Quality Questionnaire results. Unfortunately, the original coding system, which had initially been developed to study children's friendship qualities, may not have been adequate for the present study. We plan to revise the coding system and analyze the interviews in the near future. Instead of using the simple two-point dimensional system used for the present study, we may incorporate a multi-point dimensional scale to code interviews, or use an ethnographic coding software to accomplish this.

From all the above results found for the Friendship Quality Questionnaire, the concepts of Individualism and Collectivism seem to be somewhat limited in its ability to interpret the results; in the present study neither the Korean nor U.S. participants appeared to differ significantly on the dimensions of individualism or collectivism. Americans were not found to be higher in enhancement of self-worth, which is thought to be an individualistic characteristic. Still, Individualism and Collectivism may not be

completely futile, as it does apply to some results found for the present study. For instance, some might argue that Koreans' higher exclusivity may be explained by their emphasis on the inner-group, which has been thought to be a feature of collectivism.

However, in the diary study by French et al. (2003), Indonesians, who had also been assessed alongside Koreans and Americans, did not show high exclusivity, even though both Indonesia and Korea are thought to be Collectivistic cultures. In fact, interestingly enough, Indonesians were even less exclusive than the American participants. This presents some difficulty for the current application of the models of individualism and collectivism to explain friendship characteristics across cultures. It is difficult to explain how two cultures assumed to be collectivistic, i.e. Korea and Indonesia, exhibit respectively more and less exclusivity than U.S. students.

These concepts that are used extensively in cross-cultural studies may not be able to explain most observed cultural differences. It is imperative for researchers to bear in mind that these concepts can not explain all observed differences and should be used with caution, to ensure researchers are not over-generalizing their findings. At the same time though, these concepts should not be disregarded completely. It may just be that Indonesia and Korea are in fact both Collectivistic, but the two cultures express collectivism in different ways from each other. More studies are needed to verify the validity of Individualism and Collectivism.

There were several limitations to the present study. First, the measures that were used were all self-reports, which may have caused biases. For instance, as mentioned above, response set biases may have occurred. Koreans may have higher tendency to rate themselves using the middle-range scores of the scale, whereas Americans used more

extreme scores. This may be due to societal pressures to be modest in Asian cultures (Hui, 1989). Such biases can be adjusted by analyzing standardized scores across cultures, as the present study has done. The self-reporting scales may have also been biased by the effects of social desirability, in that participants rated themselves so that they fit into the societal norm, whether or not they actually exhibit a characteristic, or may have rated themselves more positively in order to “look good”.

Another limitation was that there were discrepancies in the results of the present study and the diary study, both of which assessed the same participants on the same scales, but with different measures. For example, the Friendship Quality Questionnaire did not show any significant results for Intimate disclosure, although the diaries did. The two measures may have been assessing different features of a scale, thus producing different results.

The U.S. and Korean participants also differed significantly in several aspects, which may have caused the observed differences, and not due to cultural differences. The Korean participants came from a large university with over 35,000 students, whereas the American students attended a small university of 2000 students. Also, Yonsei University is located in downtown Seoul, a very urbanized location, and IWU is located in a small town. Along with those differences, the Korean participants were interviewed by one researcher and the American participants by four. Differences in interview styles may have caused some differences in the responses of the participants. Lastly, the Americans participated as a requirement for a class grade, while the Koreans were purely voluntary and were paid more than the Americans. Fundamental differences may lie

within participants who participated solely for their own interests and those who were required to participate, thus being the cause of the differences in results across cultures.

There was also a significantly smaller number of Korean participants compared to the number of American participants. Different results may have been found if there were a larger number of Korean students. The study may have been able to produce more comprehensive results if there had been equal number of Korean and American participants in the study. French et al. (2003) also pointed out this limitation for the diary study, and stated that a larger sample size may have yielded significant results that would have supported their hypotheses.

The general lack of cross-cultural studies, along with the lack of model to explain cross-cultural differences was an additional limitation to the study. Most cross-cultural studies have utilized the concepts of Individualism and Collectivism to explain cultural differences, but this study has shown that even though cultural differences were observed, Americans and Koreans did not differ significantly in expressed Individualistic and Collectivistic values. More studies are needed to find a model that will better explain cultural variations. However, as there is a lack of such a model, the assumptions made of the results found in the present study are merely inferences.

Future implications for researchers of cross-cultural psychology include employing a multi-method assessment in their research. Instead of using only self-report measures, as the present study has, researchers may want to incorporate interviews and even observations to break out of the self-report traps. Perhaps researchers can observe interactions between friends in a laboratory setting and compared observations across cultures. French et al. (2003) also emphasize the need to assess the convergence between

multiple methods of assessment, which may lower the error variance associated with measurements of social behavior.

Future researchers should also be aware of comparing participants across cultures that differ significantly in the ecology of their environments, a limitation also pointed out by French et al. (2003). Significant differences that emerged across cultures may have been a product of different environmental effects, and not due to different cultural values. For instance, the Korean participants were recruited from a large university located in a metropolitan area, whereas the American participants were recruited from a small university located in a more rural area.

Not only should researchers assess comparable samples, they should also consider using a diversity of samples to represent a specific culture under study. For example, the students from both IWU and Yonsei University are academically talented, and most of the participants of the present study came from highly prestigious, upper-middle class families. How representative are IWU students and Yonsei students of the “typical” American and Korean culture? In order for researchers to ensure their study is accurately portraying cultural norms, a diversity of samples within each culture under study should be examined.

Finally, future cross-cultural studies may want to limit their use of the models of Individualism and Collectivism. Although these concepts may be able to predict and explain some cultural variations, it can not be used to explain every cultural difference observed. As shown in the diary study (French et al., 2003), two cultures presumed to be collectivistic Indonesians and Koreans, exhibited vastly different friendship characteristics, such as exclusiveness. Exclusivity is thought to be a collectivistic feature,

yet Indonesians did not demonstrate this characteristic. If the model applied to every culture assumed to be collectivistic, no differences should have been observed between Koreans and Indonesians.

## References

- Argyle, M., & Henderson, M. (1985). The rules of relationships. In S. Duck & D. Perlman (Eds.), Understanding personal relationships (pp. 63-84). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Argyle, M., Henderson, M., Bond, M., Iizuka, Y., & Contarello, A. (1986). Cross-cultural variations in relationship rules. International Journal of Psychology, 21, 287-315.
- Bower, B. (1997). My culture, my self. Science News, 152 (16), 248-249.
- Choi, S., Kim, U., & Choi, S. (1993). Indigenous analysis of collective representations: A Korean perspective. In U. Kim & J.W. Berry (Eds.). Indigenous Psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context (pp. 193-210). Newbury park: Sage.
- French, D.C., Bae, Y.A., Pidada, S., & Lee, O. (2003). Friendships of U.S., Korea, and Indonesian college students: Reports of social interaction and social network. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois Wesleyan University.
- French, D.C., Fosco, A., Pidada, S., Jansen, E., Riansari, M., and Nelwan P. (2002). Friendship qualities of U.S. and Indonesian children and adolescents. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois Wesleyan University.
- Goodwin, R., & Lee, I. (1994). Taboo topics among Chinese and English friends. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25(3), 325-338.
- Hui, C.H. (1989). Effects of culture and response format on extreme response styles. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20(3), 296-309.
- Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S., Gelfand, M.J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research.

- Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(5), 925-937.
- Kenrick, D.T., Neuberg, S.L., & Cialdini R.B. (2002). Social Psychology: Unraveling the Mystery. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Li, H.Z. (2002). Culture, gender, and self-close-other(s) connectedness in Canadian and Chinese samples. European Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 93-104.
- Matsumoto, (2000). Culture and psychology: People around the world. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Marsella, A.J., Devos, G., & Hsu, F.L.K. (Eds.). (1985). Culture and Self: Asian and Western Perspectives. New York, NY: Tavistock Publications.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H.M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. Psychology Bulletin, 128(1), 3-72.
- Park, K.A. (1992). Preschoolers' reactions to loss of a best friend: Developmental trends and individual differences. Child Study Journal, 22(4), 233-252.
- Shin, Y.L. (1995). Relationship between friendship, social competence, and social pretend play: Comparison between Korean- and Anglo-American Preschoolers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Singelis, T.M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20(5), 580-591.
- Smart, A. (1999). The expressions of interest: Friendship and guanxi in Chinese societies. In S. Bell & S. Coleman (Eds.), The anthropology of friendship (pp. 119-136). Oxford: Berg.



Verkuyten, M., & Masson, K. (1996). Culture and gender differences in the perception of friendship by adolescents. International Journal of Psychology, 31 (5), 207-217.

Wheeler, L., Reis, H.T., & Bond, M.H. (1989). Collectivism-individualism in everyday life: The middle kingdom and melting pot. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 79-86.

Table 1

US and Korean Participants' Demographics

	US	Korea
Age		
M	19.5	21.9
Males	19.6	22.4
Females	19.3	22
Year		
M	2.1	3.2
Freshmen	20.7%	0%
Sophomore	55.2%	22%
Junior	12.6%	36.6%
Senior	11.5%	41.5%
Religion		
Christian	75.9%	41.5%
Other	24.1%	58.5%
Income		
Low	1.1%	0%
Low-Med	3.4%	12.2%
Med	14.9%	41.5%
Med-High	28.7%	41.5%
High	43.7%	4.9%
Living Arrangement		
Home	1.1%	53.7%
Dorm	69%	17.1%
Apt	2.3%	2.4%
Other	27.6%	26.8%
Mother Education		
High School	25.3%	31.7%
College	40.2%	51.2%
Graduate	23.0%	2.4%
PhD	4.6%	4.9%
Other	6.9%	9.8%

Father Education

High School	12.6%	22.0%
College	42.5%	56.1%
Graduate	32.2%	9.8%
PhD	9.2%	9.8%
Other	3.4%	2.4%

---

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha for Individual Scales of the Friendship Quality Questionnaire

Scale	US	Korea
Companionship	.82	.79
Instrumental Aid	.74	.75
Intimate Disclosure	.91	.77
Conflict and Betrayal	.84	.76
Validation	.88	.72
Reliability	.89	.87
Exclusivity	.69	.83

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of the Raw scores and Z-scores of the Individual Scales for the Friendship Quality Questionnaire

Scale	US N=87		Korea N=40		Results
Gender	M	F	M	F	
Companionship					
Raw (SD)	5.75 (.72)	5.96 (.80)	5.41 (.93)	5.38 (.81)	C**
Z-score (SD)	.44 (.28)	.43 (.26)	.33 (.25)	.22 (.28)	C**
Instrumental Aid					
Raw (SD)	4.73 (1.00)	4.89 (1.04)	4.98 (1.08)	4.90 (.85)	N.S.
Z-score (SD)	-.10 (.42)	-.11 (.38)	.09 (.33)	-.05 (.33)	N.S.
Disclosure					
Raw (SD)	5.73 (1.08)	6.14 (1.03)	5.53 (.89)	6.13 (.63)	G**
Z-score (SD)	.44 (.40)	.50 (.30)	.39 (.45)	.65 (.30)	G*
Conflict					
Raw (SD)	3.03 (1.05)	2.50 (.76)	2.87 (.82)	3.07 (.88)	CxG*
Z-score (SD)	-.98 (.51)	-1.29 (.38)	-.96 (.50)	-.98 (.43)	N.S.
Validation					
Raw (SD)	5.20 (1.00)	5.96 (.67)	5.25 (.92)	5.71 (.53)	G**
Z-score (SD)	.14 (.36)	.41 (.22)	.25 (.31)	.39 (.22)	G**
Reliable Alliance					
Raw (SD)	5.92 (.73)	6.31 (.62)	5.97 (.88)	6.06 (.48)	N.S.
Z-score (SD)	.52 (.24)	.58 (.20)	.63 (.25)	.58 (.17)	N.S.
Exclusivity					
Raw (SD)	2.61 (.75)	2.56 (.74)	3.13 (1.03)	3.62 (.87)	C**
Z-score (SD)	-1.30 (.51)	-1.30 (.36)	-.88 (.71)	-.74 (.53)	C**

Note. F-score: (DF)= 1  
 C-Country effect.  
 G- Gender effect.  
 CxG- Interaction effect  
 N.S.- Non-significant  
 \* -  $p < .05$   
 \*\* -  $p < .01$

Table 4

Percentage Agreement between Coders and Kappa coefficient for Friendship Interview Coding

Scale	% Agreement	Kappa
Instrumental Aid-Material	99%	.663
Instrumental Aid-School	97%	.574
Instrumental Aid-Task	100%	1.0
Instrumental Aid-Advice	94%	.674
Validation	95%	.495
Disclosure	84%	.623
Companionship	79%	.326
Reliable Alliance	79%	.509
Exclusivity	98%	.276
Conflict	95%	.380
History	94%	.831
Similarity	89%	.760
Positive Characteristics	90%	.795

## Appendix A

### **Informed Consent**

We are asking you to participate in a research study “Social Relationships of IWU students” being completed by Professor Doran French of the Department of Psychology at Illinois Wesleyan University. This study is designed to explore patterns of social relationships and friendships of IWU students. Students at Padjadjaran University in Indonesia will also be participating in this cross-cultural research project.

We are interested in the characteristics of friends and your interaction with friends. We will use questionnaires, open-ended interviews and diaries of daily contact with friends to explore this question. This study will occur in two components.

The first component of the study will require approximately one hour of time. During this period, we will ask you to complete an inventory in which you identify by initials or nickname your friends and others that you interact with on a regular basis. We will then interview you about your relationship with your two closest same-gender friends and ask you to complete a questionnaire about your relationship with them. Finally, we will ask you to complete another questionnaire that assesses your beliefs about relationships with others.

The next component of the research will require you to keep brief daily diaries for 14 days in which you keep brief records of your social contacts that last more than 10 minutes.

All information from this study will be kept confidential. Although we will ask you about your friends and interaction partners, you will indicate their identity using only initials, nicknames, or codewords. We will not ask any sensitive information about your interactions as we are interested in such features as time of interaction, satisfaction with the interaction, disclosure of self and others during the interaction, and the extent to which the interaction was intimate or superficial. We have no interest in the “content” of the interaction. Thus, we will not ask you exactly what you did or what you talked about.

You are free to participate or to not participate in this research. You may withdraw from this study at any point. You may refuse to answer any questions. The information that you provide will be strictly confidential and will not be shared. The data from the study will likely be published, but no information about you will be presented (only group averages will be reported).

You will receive three credits of research compensation credit for participating in this study. To obtain these credits, you will need to complete the entire study. If you complete the entire study, you will also receive \$10.00 in cash. Should you withdraw prior to completing the entire study, you will receive one research credit. Any questions about this study may be directed to Dr. Doran French of the department of Psychology (3662; [dfrench@titan.iwu.edu](mailto:dfrench@titan.iwu.edu)). Other questions may be directed to Kristina McDonald, [kmcdonal@sun.iwu.edu](mailto:kmcdonal@sun.iwu.edu), or Alyx Bae [ybae@sun.iwu.edu](mailto:ybae@sun.iwu.edu) who are students working on this project. They can be reached at 556-1068.

This project has been approved by the IWU Institutional Review Board. This committee oversees research with human participants. Questions about this aspect of the study may be

directed to Dr. K. Scherck (3271) who is the chair of this committee.

---

I have read and understand the information provided about the study "Social Interaction of IWU students" and I freely consent to participate. I understand, however, that I may to withdraw from participation at any time for any reason.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of researcher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Contact Information:



## Appendix B

### Demographics

In order to accurately describe our group of participants, we would like you to complete the short questionnaire about yourself and your parents. This information will be kept anonymous, and will be used only to compare the characteristics of the United States and Indonesia participants in this study. If for any reason you would prefer not to answer any question, please complete the remaining sections of the questionnaire and leave that question blank.

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Year in School \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Major \_\_\_\_\_

4. Race of mother (circle one)

Caucasian/white	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander
Native American	Hispanic	Other

5. Race of father (circle one)

Caucasian/white	African American	Asian/Pacific Islander
Native American	Hispanic	Other

6. Religion

Muslim      Hindu      Buddhist      Christian      Other(specify) \_\_\_\_\_

7. Annual Household Income (circle one)

Below \$20,000

\$20,000-\$39,999

\$40,000-\$59,999

\$60,000-\$89,000

\$90,000 and above

8. Household Composition (who do you live with)

Both biological parents

One biological parent and one step-parent

One biological parent

Other(specify)\_\_\_\_\_

9. School living arrangement? I live with \_\_\_\_\_ other people (this is the number of students you live together with).

Live at home

Dormitory Room

Sorority/Fraternity

Apartment

Other(specify)\_\_\_\_\_

10. How often do you interact with children? (circle)

Never      Little(1-2/ month)      Sometimes(3-5/ month)

Often(2/ week)      Always(3+/ week)

11. What kind of experience have you had with pre-school children within the past 3 years? (circle)

Siblings      Baby-sitting      Work with children      Relatives

Other(specify)\_\_\_\_\_

12. Mother's education level? (circle)      High School      College

Graduate Level      Ph.D.      Other(specify)\_\_\_\_\_

13. Father's education level? (circle)      High School      College

Graduate Level      Ph.D.      Other(specify)\_\_\_\_\_

14. Father's occupation? Please describe as completely as possible (e.g. 'foreman in a machine shop,' 'owner of a general store').\_\_\_\_\_

15. Mother's occupation? Please describe as completely as possible.\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C

### Independence/Interdependence Scale

Name: \_\_\_\_\_, Age: \_\_\_\_\_, Sex: M / F, Year: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Questionnaire

Please rate how well the following statements describe you, using the 10 point scale below (use integral numbers such as 1, not decimal numbers, such as 2.5). Put your rating on the line before each statement. Work as quickly as possible. Do not worry about the consistency of your responses.

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| 0 -- 1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 -- 6 -- 7 -- 8 -- 9 |                           |
| Doesn't describe<br>me at all                  | Describes me<br>very much |
- 
- \_\_\_ 1. When making a decision, I first consider how it will affect others before considering how it will affect me.
  - \_\_\_ 2. How I behave depends upon the people around in the situation.
  - \_\_\_ 3. I feel guilty when I say "No" to someone who asks for help.
  - \_\_\_ 4. I am special.
  - \_\_\_ 5. Nothing can keep me from doing something if I want to do it.
  - \_\_\_ 6. I feel it is important to maintain harmony in the group.
  - \_\_\_ 7. If someone helps me, I feel a strong obligation to return the favor sometime later.
  - \_\_\_ 8. It is important to me that I remain in a group if the group needs me even though I am not happy with the group.
  - \_\_\_ 9. I feel it is better to follow tradition or authority than to try to do something in my own way.
  - \_\_\_ 10. It is important to me that I am liked by many others.
  - \_\_\_ 11. It is important to me that I am a cooperative participant in group activities.
  - \_\_\_ 12. If what I believe is right hurts other people's feelings, I would rather not insist on it.

- ☐ 13. I am always myself. I do not act like other people.
  - ☐ 14. If other people do not like my idea, I tend to change it, even though I like it.
  - ☐ 15. I have difficulty saying "No" when people ask me for help.
  - ☐ 16. I am aware of other people's expectations of me.
  - ☐ 17. If I like it, I do not care what other people would think of my idea.
  - ☐ 18. Since other people's business is not mine, I might feel bad but not guilty when I need to say "No" when I am asked for help.
  - ☐ 19. Even though people around me may hold a different opinion, I stick to what I believe in.
  - ☐ 20. No matter what the situation or setting is, I am always true to myself.
  - ☐ 21. It is important to me that I always make a favorable impression on others.
  - ☐ 22. The most important thing to me is to have a sense of belonging in my own group(s).
  - ☐ 23. It is important to me to maintain a good relationship with everybody.
  - ☐ 24. I can take care of myself.
  - ☐ 25. I have planned my future.
  - ☐ 26. I know my weaknesses and strengths.
  - ☐ 27. I usually make my decisions myself.
  - ☐ 28. I always know what I want.
  - ☐ 29. I always care about what other people think of me.
  - ☐ 30. Before making a decision, I always consult with others.
  - ☐ 31. I am unique- different from others in many respects.
-

## Appendix D

### Friendship Quality Questionnaire

Answer the following questions using this 7 point scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
does not accurately...			This only partly...			This very much...

...describe(s) my friend or friendship.

- \_\_\_1. We have conflicts that we have not yet resolved.
- \_\_\_2. We like to sit near each other during class, meals, or activities.
- \_\_\_3. There are important secrets that we have shared.
- \_\_\_4. I know that he/she will keep the promises that he/she has made to me.
- \_\_\_5. He/she helps me with tasks so that I can get done faster.
- \_\_\_6. We do fun things together.
- \_\_\_7. We disagree about things.
- \_\_\_8. If I need help, I can count on he/she to provide it.
- \_\_\_9. We tell each other private things.
- \_\_\_10. He/she would like me even if others do not.
- \_\_\_11. We enjoy spending time together.
- \_\_\_12. We loan each other things.
- \_\_\_13. One of us sometimes annoys the other one.
- \_\_\_14. We tell each other things that we wouldn't tell other people.
- \_\_\_15. Our friendship is more fun when other friends do things with us than when we
- \_\_\_16. are only with the two of us.
- \_\_\_17. He/she helps me with my schoolwork.
- \_\_\_18. If others were talking about me behind my back, he/she would stand up for me.
- \_\_\_19. One of us has violated the trust of the other one.
- \_\_\_20. We like to be together whenever we can.
- \_\_\_21. I can trust him or her not to tell others my secrets.
- \_\_\_22. I would rather spend time alone with my friend than to be with him/her in a group.
- \_\_\_23. He/she tells me that I am good at things.
- \_\_\_24. I can be sure that he/she will be my friend, even in bad times.
- \_\_\_25. This friendship makes me feel good about myself.
- \_\_\_26. My friend and I enjoy having others join us for activities.
- \_\_\_27. We often get angry at each other.
- \_\_\_28. We do not question each other's commitment to support each other when we need it.
- \_\_\_29. We make each other feel important and special.
- \_\_\_30. We know secrets about each other.
- \_\_\_31. We help each other by running errands (eg. Going to the store, picking up things from school, taking things to someone.)
- \_\_\_32. We communicate to each other that we like each other.

- \_\_\_33. We tell each other about our problems.
- \_\_\_34. We enjoy many of the same types of recreational activities.
- \_\_\_35. He/she makes me feel good about my ideas.
- \_\_\_36. If one of us has some free time, we will seek out the other for companionship
- \_\_\_37. We prefer to include other friends in the things that we do together.
- \_\_\_38. My friend and I hang out together.
- \_\_\_39. If one of us has another close friend it causes problems in our relationship.
- \_\_\_40. We often argue.
- \_\_\_41. We help each other do our chores.
- \_\_\_42. I know that my friend will always be loyal to me.
- \_\_\_43. He/she communicates to me that I am pretty smart.
- \_\_\_44. One of us has said mean things about the other one to other people.
- \_\_\_45. If one of us needs money, the other will loan or give it to us.
- \_\_\_46. Our friendship is more fun if it is just the two of us and others are not around.

## Appendix E

### Friendship Interview

#### **College Student Friendship Interview**

[To be completed on two closest same-sex friends]

1. Why do you like this person?
  - 1a. Is there anything else that you can tell me about why you like this person?
2. Describe the important characteristics of your friendship. {example-perhaps your friendship is special because you both like to go bowling, or perhaps because you both like to stay up very late at night, or perhaps you both enjoy arguing about different political views}
  - 2a. Is there anything else that you can tell me about the important characteristics of your friendship?
3. Describe how you and your friend behave when you are together, with just the two of you.
  - 3a. Is there anything else that you can tell me about how you and your friend behave when you are alone together?
4. Describe how you and your friend interact when you two are together with other people.
  - 4a. Is there anything else that you can tell me about how you and your friend interact when you two are together with other people?
5. Is there anything you do not like about your friend?
  - 5a. Is there anything else that you can tell me that you do not like your friend?
6. Is there anything that you do not like about your friendship, or how the two of you behave when you are together?
  - 6a. Is there anything else that you can tell me that you do not like about your friendship?

7. What do you think are the most important reasons you and this person are friends?  
It is ok if you wish to repeat any of the information that you have already told us.

7a. Can you think of any other important reasons that you and this person are friends?



## Appendix F

### Debriefing

Thanks for your help!

The dimensions of individualism and collectivism have been studied extensively within cultural psychology. Individualistic cultures emphasize individual achievement and their own desires before those of a group. Collectivistic cultures emphasize group harmony and place the needs of the group before their own wants and desires.

There has been considerable speculation regarding the differences in the social relations of persons in individualistic and collectivistic cultures, yet little research has been done. This present study extends research on the friendships of Indonesian and American children by focusing on the social relationships of Indonesian and American adults. In this study, we focused on three features of friendship and social relations. One was the composition of social networks, which included things such as the length of friendships and gender of friends. We also looked at the qualities of same-gender friendships on features such as intimacy, instrumental aid, companionship, inclusion and exclusion. The last feature we investigated through the journal exercise was the time, diversity, and quality of the interaction.

Through the measures that you completed we expect to see several cross-cultural differences. We expect that the social networks of the Indonesian sample will be larger than the American sample. However, we expect that the interactions recorded will be higher in quality and intimacy in the American sample. We also suspect that the characteristics of friendships will be dissimilar, as the Indonesian population will report more instrumental aid from their friends, while Americans will report more common interests and similar personalities. Through this research we hope to see how individualistic and collectivistic values affect social relationships. We hope to extend this study to another collectivistic country and assess if there are variations of the social interaction dimension between two collectivistic countries.

If you have any questions in the future please contact Dr. Doran French at (309) 556-3662.

If you are interested in this study and would like further information, the following is recommended reading used in this study.

Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.

Thanks again for your participation. Your help is of great service as we explore the cultural differences in social interaction.